

May 28, 1968

E 4765

Federal inspector's report: "... Beef was being broken on an open dock, by a dirt road, in 95-degree weather. There were flies in meat. Drums of bones and meat scraps were covered with maggots."

Subsequently, John P. Orcutt, Colorado's commissioner of agriculture, identified the plant that Mr. Johnson had referred to and stated the conditions cited were not so. He said the dock is located adjacent to a paved street—not a dirt road—and that the plant's owner flatly denies there was any truth in the inspector's report. He quotes the owner as stating: "Beef is not broken (cut up) on our dock and never has been. . . . If this so-called inspector saw any meat scraps or bones in drums, he must be a contortionist, as our bone barrels are stored bottom side up." Mr. Orcutt says the plant owner insists the Federal inspector never entered the processing area of the plant and so he couldn't have seen the barrels in use.

A diligent effort to determine precisely how and why the quickie survey came about turns up no definitive answers. It is known, however, that many congressmen were not impressed by the results of an old USDA survey made in 1962. Though it was an extensive and serious study of meat-inspection operations, the facts in it were well-dated by the summer of 1967. This, incidentally, did not discourage publicists, public and private, from dramatically citing those stale findings to marshal support for fresh legislation last year.

The man in the Agriculture Department who initiated the survey was Rodney Leonard.

"Mr. Purcell [Rep. Graham Purcell, the Texas Democrat who is chairman of the House Agriculture subcommittee] asked us to update the old survey made in 1962 showing that many of the non-Federally inspected plants were in bad shape," Mr. Leonard says. "We knew that many states had passed new meat-inspection laws and had strengthened old ones. But we also knew, through our compliance and evaluation activities, that actual enforcement of good sanitation and good meat inspection wasn't much better than it was in 1962."

Mr. Purcell says he may have asked Mr. Leonard to update the old survey at the request of some of the other subcommittee members. "Representative Foley, perhaps, and others," he says. "I personally thought we had a good bill and that additional surveys weren't needed." Indeed, the new survey's timing and effect were peculiarly unsuited for Mr. Purcell's purposes. The furor the survey caused torpedoed the mild meat-inspection bill that emerged from the House subcommittee, which was basically the bill Mr. Purcell himself had introduced.

Mr. Leonard continues: "I told Bob [Dr. Robert K. Somers, chief of the meat-inspection service] to try to make the survey. I did it. I should have been more specific about how to handle it."

Dr. Somers relayed Mr. Leonard's request to Berlin H. Rorem, acting director of the compliance and evaluation staff. It was Mr. Rorem who telephoned the C&E's field offices and got matters rolling.

On July 27, Mr. Michael wrote his memo. When The National Observer called his office last week to talk with him, a reporter was told he was sick at home. Mr. Leonard says Mr. Michael explained recently that he wrote the memo in such explicit form because some of his staff members were new to his office and he wanted to make sure nobody misunderstood what was expected. Mr. Michael has been in the meat-inspection service for more than 20 years.

Mr. Rorem says his memory is dim as to precisely what he said in telephone calls to the C&E's six field offices in Dallas, Kansas City, Chicago, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Atlanta. He does deny he told anyone to call it "Project Quick, Quiet, and Confidential."

"I certainly didn't tell anyone to look for 'horrible examples,'" Mr. Rorem says. "I

didn't have to. Those men are experienced inspectors. They knew where to go, what to look for, and how to write their reports."

It might be added that they also know how to follow orders.

U.S. GOVERNMENT MEMORANDUM

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL, TOP PRIORITY,
RUSH PROJECT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE
COMPLIANCE AND EVALUATION
STAFF,

Dallas, Tex., July 27, 1967.

To: All Dallas Area, Compliance Officers.
From: Wilbur F. Michael, Officer in Charge.
Subject: Special Project QQ&C (Quick, Quiet and Confidential).

Effective immediately, we are to discontinue all other C&E work and devote full time (plus any overtime necessary to effectively complete this assignment) to "Project QQ&C." Overtime will not be authorized for travel.

The information we will gather at Non-Federally Inspected (NFI) plants in this effort is to be used at Congressional hearings now being held in connection with the proposed amendment (HR-6168) to the Meat Inspection Act.

For the purpose of this project, the following areas of responsibility are assigned: Barrett—Colorado and Oklahoma; Halverson—Arkansas; and Ramos—Texas and Louisiana.

We have been designated to make this "survey" since our presence in NFI plants would attract less attention than any other USDA personnel, as we are normally in and out of these plants.

This project consists of 3 parts, as follows:
1. You are to gain entrance into NFI plants (slaughter and/or processing) under the guise of (a) meeting local inspection personnel to gain cooperation in our normal C&E work, (b) discussing our denaturing and decharacterizing requirements with management, (c) etc. This should be done quickly and quietly in such a manner that no one is aware of the real purpose of your visit. This will require a very discreet approach and may tax your imagination. Other approaches used to gain entrance to NFI plants are: (1) requesting management's permission to check their freezers for product bearing Federal Marks of Inspection that might be forged or counterfeit, (2) explaining to and showing management how Federal Marks of Inspection must be obliterated before used containers are filled.

The sole purpose of your visit is to observe, and for each plant visited, submit a written report direct to B. H. Rorem, Acting Director, C&E, USDA, South Agric. Building, Room 2614, Washington, D.C. 20250, (copy to me), listing any deficiencies noted that indicate a need for tighter inspectional controls. You are not to limit your observations to the following, but examples of things to be checked are: (a) *Plant Facilities*—window and door screens, drainage, types of floors, ceilings and walls, lighting, welfare facilities, equipment, etc., (b) *Environmental Sanitation*—Availability of sterilizers for equipment used on diseased or contaminated meat, hand washing facilities, cleanliness of employees and their clothing, spitting on floor, cleanliness of equipment (describe type of dirt or filth, stipulate amount only if excessive), etc., (c) *Inspectional Procedures*—lack of or inadequate ante and post mortem inspection, tempering of cooked product containing pork, labeling controls, etc., (d) *4-D type Animals Held in livestock pens for Slaughter*—Cancer-Eye, downers, deads, cripples, (e) *Plant Operations Procedures*—meat and/or product in contact with floors, contamination of carcasses with manure, pus, dirt, etc., in dressing operation, deceptive packing, etc.

Plants selected for this survey will be those in which you would expect to find the most discrepancies. In other words, look for "horrible examples."

2. In 1963, Dr. M. R. Clarkson prepared a report concerning a comprehensive fall and winter survey made in 1962 by MID of intrastate meat packers and processors in 48 states. Their report showed there was widespread use of false or deceptive labels or packing and that much intrastate meat contained diseased tissues and spoiled, putrid, filthy materials.

Please submit a report to me stating what each of the states you are concerned with, has accomplished in the way of corrective measures (as new laws, etc.) since 1963.

3. You are to each collect a minimum of five retail samples of NFI produced meat food product. If time permits and you find additional products you feel should be sampled, feel free to do so. It is expected that most of this sampling will need to be done on Saturday and Sunday. This will leave the weekdays through next Wednesday for your survey of NFI plants. Incidentally, all of this work must be completed by Wednesday, August 2, 1967.

The samples are to be air mailed to the Meat Inspection Laboratory, U.S. Court and Customhouse Building, 1114 Market Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63101. You should select product you believe might be violative. Be sure you get labels if available. Labels should be attached to the 6th copy of the MI-422, which will be mailed directly to Rorem. You keep the 7th copy and mail 5th copy directly to me. Original and all other copies should accompany the sample. If hamburger is sampled, be sure it is produced in a meat plant and not ground by the retail store. Purchase and use dry ice you feel necessary to pack with your sample. Contact your nearest MI office for sample mailing containers, bags, etc.

Attached is a specimen copy of MI-422 to be used as a guide in their preparation. Be sure all information shown on the specimen is included. In block No. 3, show "Non-Inspected-1" for your first sample, "Non-Inspected-2" for your 2nd sample and so on.

Use the attached chart to determine the particular analyses you desire laboratory to do. Desired analyses not printed in blocks on the MI-422 should be written in the "other" blocks.

Also attached for your use is a paper listing "Analysis Which the MI Laboratories are Able to Perform," including species determination and coagulation tests to determine highest temperature attained in cooked products. Suggest this analysis be made on smoked sausage to determine if possible live trichinae have been destroyed.

In your reports of plant "surveys" it is suggested you use dramatic, graphic terms with impact, such as cancer-eye, pus, manure, disease, excreta, cock-roaches, rats, flies, loose paint, cobwebs, rust, grease, overhead dripping sewer lines, toilet facilities, mice, flour, excess water, chemicals, excess fat, etc., instead of other more acceptable terms. Of course, you must be factual in your reports. Try to find evidence of contaminants on the meat if possible.

Please keep in daily contact with this office and give us telephone contact points, etc., where you might be reached.

Enclosed are pre-addressed "franks" for the St. Louis Laboratory.

I am to phone Mr. Rorem next Monday to report our progress.

Enclosures—4.

THE QUESTION OF WIRETAPPING

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1968

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, with the passage last week by the Senate of the crime-in-the-streets bill much national

attention was focused on the question of wiretapping. Recent public statements by knowledgeable persons and stories in the newspapers by eminent journalists have also brought the spotlight to rest on this very important legal and moral matter.

Since I have received mail on this subject from my constituents, I would like to make as a matter of public record my views on wiretapping.

Wiretapping is of great concern to me. It is an instrument with the potential for much good, for instance to combat crime. Yet, improperly utilized, it can cause great damage to our sacred individual rights. For that reason I feel that the jurisdiction over wiretapping should come under close Government scrutiny. Not everyone should be authorized to allow wiretapping. I believe that because of its wide ramifications, wiretapping authority should be entrusted only to the President of the United States and used only in matters of vital national security for the national defense.

Wiretapping could also be authorized on court order, similar to search warrants now issued on the request of law-enforcement officials. This would mean that a wiretapping order would be granted only after a police officer had made a thorough determination that it was necessary for the prosecution of a certain case and had sufficient evidence to prove this request before a court of law. Only after proof was given would the court issue the wiretapping order.

I believe that if we concentrate the power to authorize wiretapping in the hands of the courts of law and the President of the United States, we will prevent its abuse.

ISRAEL'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1968

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, May 15 marked the 20th anniversary of the State of Israel. I am pleased to pay tribute to the noble people who have succeeded in building a strong nation in a strategic part of the world despite enormous obstacles.

The development of Israel is one of the great success stories of this century. In 1948 when Israel proclaimed her independence she did not know which nations were her friends. With hostile nations surrounding her and a large portion of the land within her boundaries considered wasteland, Israel faced tremendous problems. Many of these problems have been overcome.

Israel has transformed much of her land into a highly productive state. Three-fourths of her food is now home grown and the value of agricultural production has increased tenfold in 20 years.

While the people of Israel are peace-loving, they have shown their enemies that they have the military strength and the determination to deal with aggressive acts. They are a permanent nation of the free world.

The United States, under the leadership of President Harry S. Truman, was the first nation to recognize the State of Israel. We should all be proud of the bonds of friendship which have grown since our first act of faith in behalf of Israel 20 years ago.

It is a privilege to congratulate the people of Israel on their great success. I believe each anniversary will mark even greater advances.

E-W FEDERAL BUSINESS GAINS FROM FREE TRADE

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite encouraging to note the proposals contained in the President's Trade Expansion Act of 1968. There are two major areas in which the President's international trade recommendations seem to have particular significance.

The first is concerned with the elimination of the American selling price valuation system. At the present time, the U.S. chemical industry is the primary beneficiary of the ASP. Forty years ago, the ASP performed a needed function for what was then a young, struggling industry. But today the U.S. chemical industry is a formidable competitor in world chemical trade and the ASP is no longer needed to sustain it.

Our country's trade negotiators have been successful in obtaining significant concessions directly beneficial to our domestic chemical industry in exchange for the elimination of the ASP. But, we must act first, in order to gain the benefit of those concessions.

The President's Trade Expansion Act of 1968 will enable us to get those benefits.

The second area of importance under the new trade legislation concerns adjustment assistance for American workers and firms that are adversely affected by import competition.

In 1962 when we first adopted the Trade Expansion Act, we gave solemn assurances that help would be forthcoming for workers and firms adversely affected by our trade concessions. For various reasons, we have not been able to make good on that commitment.

Happily, the proposals in the new trade legislation presented to the Congress today will correct this situation. I support the President's trade bill as beneficial to workers and business alike. His message follows:

GREATER PROSPERITY THROUGH WORLD TRADE

To the Congress of the United States:

A nation's trade lines are its life lines. Open trade lines and active commerce lead to economic health and growth. Closed trade lines end in economic stagnation.

Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized these truths more than thirty years ago, when the nation and the world were in the grip of Depression.

On that March day in 1934 when he asked

the Congress to pass the historic Reciprocal Trade Act, he pointed to America's declining world trade and what it meant to the nation: "Idle hands, still machines, ships tied to their docks."

That Act set in motion three and a half decades of descending tariff barriers and rising world trade. Our producers and farmers found new markets abroad, and American exports multiplied twenty-fold.

This era of commercial progress was capped by the Kennedy Round Agreements reached at Geneva last year—the greatest success in all the history of international trade negotiations.

When I reported to the Congress last November on the Kennedy Round, I said it would mean new factories, more jobs, lower prices to families, and higher incomes for American workers and for our trading partners throughout the world.

Already, through these Agreements, tariff barriers everywhere are falling, bringing savings to consumers, and opening new overseas markets for competitive producers.

But the problems and the promises of world trade are always changing. We must have the tools not only to adjust to change, but to turn change to our advantage.

To prepare for the era of world trade unfolding before us now, I submit to the Congress today the Trade Expansion Act of 1968. This measure will:

maintain our negotiating authority to settle—advantageously—trade problems and disputes.

carry out the special Geneva agreement on chemicals and other products.

improve the means through which American firms and workers can adjust to new competition from increased imports.

OUR INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The Trade Expansion Act of 1968 will strengthen relations with our trading partners in three ways.

First, it will extend through June 30, 1970 the President's authority to conduct negotiations for tariff reductions. This authority was contained in provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 that have expired.

Most of this authority was used in negotiating the Kennedy Round. The unused portion of that Authority will give the President the flexibility to adjust tariff rates as future developments might require.

For example, the United States might find it necessary to increase the duty on a particular article—as the result of an "escape clause" action or a statutory change in tariff classification. In such event, we would be obliged to give other nations compensatory tariff adjustments for their trade losses.

Without this authority, we would invite retaliation and endanger American markets abroad.

I recommend that the President's authority to make these tariff adjustments be extended through June 30, 1970.

Second, the Trade Expansion Act of 1968 will eliminate the American Selling Price system of customs valuation. This action is necessary to carry out the special agreement reached during the Kennedy Round.

The American Selling Price system has outlived its purpose. It should be ended.

The generally accepted method of valuing goods for tariff purposes—which we and all our trading partners employ—is to use the actual price of the item to the importer.

But many years ago, to protect a few of our fledgling industries, we imposed on competing foreign goods—in addition to a substantial tariff—the special requirement that their tariff value be determined by American prices. Today this unusual system often produces tariff protection of more than 100 percent of the import cost of the product.

Such excessive protection is both unfair and unnecessary.

This system is unfair because it—

Gives to a few industries a special privilege available to no other American business. Rests on an arbitrary method of valuation which no other nation uses.

Diverges from the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Imposes an unjustified burden on the U.S. consumer.

This system is unnecessary because the few industries which it covers no longer need special government protection.

It applies primarily to the chemical industry in the benzenoid field. Yet chemicals, and benzenoids in particular, are among our most efficient and rapidly expanding industries. They have done well at home. They have done well in the international market. They are in a strong position to face normal competition from imports.

A supplementary agreement was negotiated at Geneva which will lower foreign tariffs on American chemicals and reduce certain non-tariff barriers—road taxes and tariff preferences—on American automobiles and tobacco. To receive these important concessions, the United States must eliminate the American Selling Price valuation system and thereby give foreign producers of chemicals and a few other products normal access to our markets. This bargain is clearly in our national interest—good for our industries, good for our workers, and good for our consumers.

I recommend that the Congress eliminate the American Selling Price system to remove inequities in our tariffs and enable us to take advantage of concessions negotiated in the Kennedy Round.

Third, the Trade Expansion Act of 1968 will provide for specific funding of our participation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

This is the procedure we follow in meeting our financial responsibilities to all other international organizations.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has become the most important forum for the conduct of international trade relations. The Kennedy Round took place under its auspices. Yet since 1947, we have financed our annual contribution to this Agreement through general contingency funds rather than through a specific authorization.

I recommend that the Congress authorize specific appropriations for the American share of the expenses of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

OUR NEEDS AT HOME

When trade barriers fall, the American people and the American economy benefit. Open trade lines:

Reduce prices of goods from abroad.

Increase opportunities for American businesses and farms to export their products. This means expanded production and more job opportunities.

Help improve the efficiency and competitive strength of our industries. This means a higher rate of economic growth for our nation and higher incomes for our people.

Some firms, however, have difficulty in meeting foreign competition, and need time and help to make the adjustment.

Since international trade strengthens the nation as a whole, it is only fair that the government assist those businessmen and workers who face serious problems as a result of increased imports.

The Congress recognized this need—in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—by establishing a program of trade adjustment assistance to businessmen and workers adversely affected by imports.

Unfortunately, this program has been ineffective. The test of eligibility has proved to be too rigid, too technical, and too complicated.

As part of a comprehensive trade expansion policy, I propose that we make our adjustment assistance program fair and workable.

I recommend that Congress broaden the eligibility for this assistance. The test should be simple and clear: relief should be available whenever increased imports are a substantial cause of injury.

I intend to pattern the administration of this program on the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. Determinations of eligibility will be made jointly by the Secretaries of Labor, Commerce and Treasury.

The adjustment assistance provisions of Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 have been successful. They have well served American automobile firms and their workers as we have moved to create an integrated U.S.-Canadian auto market.

These provisions will expire on June 30.

I recommend that the Congress extend the adjustment assistance provisions of the Automotive Products Trade Act through June 30, 1971.

TRADE INITIATIVES FOR THE FUTURE

The measures I have recommended today will help us carry forward the great tradition of our reciprocal trade policy.

But even as we consolidate our past gains, we must look to the future.

First and foremost, we must ensure that the progress we have made is not lost through new trade restrictions.

One central fact is clear. A vicious cycle of trade restrictions harms most the nation which trades most. And America is that nation.

At the present time, proposals pending before the Congress would impose quotas or other trade restrictions on the imports of over twenty industries. These measures would cover about \$7 billion of our imports—close to half of all imports subject to duty.

In a world of expanding trade, such restrictions would be self-defeating. Under international rules of trade, a nation restricts imports only at the risk of its own exports. Restriction begets restriction.

In reality, "protectionist" measures do not protect any of us:

They do not protect the American working man. If world markets shrink, there will be fewer jobs.

They do not protect the American businessman. In the long run, smaller markets will mean smaller profits.

They do not protect the American consumer. He will pay more for the goods he buys.

The fact is that every American—directly or indirectly—has a stake in the growth and vitality of an open economic system.

Our policy of liberal trade has served this nation well. It will continue to advance our interests in the future.

But these are critical times for the nation's economy. We have launched a series of measures to reduce a serious balance of payments deficit. As part of this program, I have called for a major long-run effort to increase our trade surplus. This requires that we push ahead with actions to keep open the channels of trade.

Many of our trading partners have indicated a willingness to cooperate in this effort by accelerating some of their tariff reductions agreed to in the Kennedy Round, and by permitting the United States to defer a portion of our tariff reductions. Furthermore, a number of Western European countries are now taking more active steps to achieve a higher rate of economic growth. This promises to increase the demand for our exports and improve our trade position.

To take full advantage of the expanded trading opportunities that lie ahead, we must improve the competitive position of American goods. Passage of the anti-inflation tax is the most critical action we could take now to strengthen our position at home and in world markets. The tax measure I have recommended will help prevent destructive price increases—which can sap the vitality and strength of our economy. Continued rapid

increases in our prices would mean fewer exports and higher imports.

Second, other nations must join with us to put an end to non-tariff barriers.

Trade is a two-way street. A successful trade policy must be built upon reciprocity. Our own trade initiatives will founder unless our trading partners join with us in these efforts.

The Kennedy Round was an outstanding example of international cooperation. But major non-tariff barriers continue to impede the free flow of international commerce. These barriers now block many U.S. products from competing for world markets.

Some non-tariff barriers violate provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. We will step up our efforts to secure the prompt removal of these illegal restrictions.

Other non-tariff barriers may not be illegal, but they clearly hamper and hinder trade. Such barriers are found in all countries; the American Selling Price system is an example of one of our non-tariff barriers.

We have initiated a major international study to assess the effect of non-tariff barriers on world trade.

We have already begun action in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and other international organizations to deal with some of these non-tariff barriers.

Efforts such as these are an important element in our trade policy. All sides must be prepared to dismantle unjustified or unreasonable barriers to trade.

Reciprocity and fair play are the essential standards for international trade. America will insist on these conditions in all our negotiations to lower non-tariff barriers.

Third, we must develop a long-range policy to guide American trade expansion through the 1970's.

I have directed the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations to make an intensive study of our future trade requirements and needs.

I would hope that Members of the Congress and leaders of Labor, Business and Agriculture will work with the Executive Branch in this effort. To help develop the foundations of a far-reaching policy, I will issue an Executive Order that establishes a wide basis for consultation and assistance in this important work.

AN EXPANDING ERA IN WORLD TRADE

The proposals in this message have been shaped to one purpose—to develop the promise of an expanding era in world trade.

We started on this road three and a half decades ago. In the course of that journey, the American farmer, the businessman, the worker and the consumer have benefitted.

The road ahead can lead to new levels of prosperity and achievement for the American people. The Trade Expansion Act of 1968 will speed us on the way.

I urge the Congress to give this important measure its prompt and favorable consideration.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
 THE WHITE HOUSE, May 28, 1968.

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY, OF NEW YORK, RECEIVES HONORARY DEGREE

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI
 OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1968

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York, recently toured Korea, South Vietnam, and other areas in Southeast Asia. Mr.

Murphy is no stranger to this area; it was his third battlefield inspection of Vietnam, and he had served in Korea during the Korean War, where he won the Distinguished Service Cross, the Nation's second highest award for bravery. While in Korea Mr. Murphy was awarded an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws by the Sung Kyun Kwan University in Seoul. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of Mr. Murphy's speech on that occasion:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY OF NEW YORK AT SUNG KYUN KWAN UNIVERSITY, SEOUL, KOREA, UPON RECEIVING AN HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS, APRIL 15, 1968

The university occupies a key position in the life of a nation. As the depository for the cultural and intellectual wealth of a nation, the university provides the stability and continuity necessary to preserve and protect the nation's identity.

Regardless of changes in government or rule, whether they be internal or external, as long as the university survives, the nation will be assured of retaining its sense of purpose and direction and meaning.

As an American I cannot help be impressed with the longevity of your university. In the United States our oldest and most distinguished universities are only a few hundred years old, Sung Kyun Kwan University has been in operation for nearly a millennium, and was training leaders for your nation before my country had even been discovered.

But while a university is a link with the past, it is also a bridge to the future, while it preserves the old, it must also discover the new; it must be flexible enough to meet the demands of a changing world without sacrificing the strength and stability it derives from its ancient heritage.

Sung Kyun Kwan University has successfully met this dual responsibility. It met the impact of Western Civilization in the 19th century by introducing a new educational system to reap the benefits of both Eastern and Western culture; the year 1895 marks the date when your modern university was established.

Today, Sung Kyun Kwan University continues to play a leading role in the development of this nation. It is training a new generation of leaders who will lead Korea into the 21st century, just as it trained many of the leaders who today guide your nation.

But the university also fosters the educational, social and cultural development of the rest of the nation. It is both an example to be followed, and a stimulus to those who would follow. The great economic and social progress which today is so evident in Korea is directly indebted to this fine university.

In receiving this honorary Doctor of Laws Degree, I am honored first by the fact that this university occupies such a hallowed position in the history, both past and present, of your nation.

I am honored second because I feel very close to both your country and your people. I helped in your effort to defend your freedom more than fifteen years ago, and since that time I have maintained close ties with my many Korean friends, both in my country and here in Korea. I have met many of your national legislators when they visited the Congress of the United States, and I found that we had much in common, both as individuals and as nations. I am also proud to say that I am an honorary citizen of Kyung Sang Nam Do province.

Third, I am honored because this degree is in a field which I consider to be the most important in any free society. As a Representative in the Congress of the United

States, it is my job to help write the laws which guide my nation, and I believe that the strength of the nation depends in a large part on the strength of those laws.

Law is the fabric of our societies. It is the source of our strength, it gives order to our lives, and it provides the framework within which we can live and prosper as individuals to the fullest extent of our capabilities.

Basically law is an expression of the relationship between men. It sets forth this relationship in a formal manner, but it is essentially an acknowledgment that men must respect the rights of the individual, that men share a common purpose in life, that men desire to be free to pursue their own goals in life, and that to do so they must establish a legal framework which protects both their own rights and the rights of others.

This common understanding between men evolves into mutual respect among nations. For the rights claimed by an individual are those claimed by a nation. Just as individuals want the freedom to live their own lives, so do nations want this freedom; just as men realize that cooperation and mutual respect for the differences between them is essential for orderly development of any society, so must nations realize that cooperation and mutual respect are essential for the peaceful development of the world.

The United States and Korea have fought for this philosophy in the past, and we stand shoulder to shoulder today in Vietnam fighting for it once again. It is our common desire to live in peace under this philosophy, but it is also our common pledge to resist any attempt to destroy this philosophy.

It has been said that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." This has never been more true than it is today. Freedom cannot be sacrificed in one part of the world without endangering it throughout the world.

I am confident, however, that the universal desire for freedom will prevail on this planet, for freedom is the strongest force we know today. Man's technology has produced awesome weapons of mass destruction, but none has the power of an idea or a dream. Bombs can threaten to destroy much of the world, but the concept of freedom will eventually rule the world.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the great tragedy of these times is the subjugation of peoples under the Fascist-like dictatorship of Communists who now dominate the lands of Eastern Europe, the Balkans, and the Caucasus. One of the proudest of these nations is the Armenian people, its homeland now reduced to a puppet state in the U.S.S.R. But it was not always so. Just 50 years ago, the Armenians were a free and independent people with their own Government and their own state, without the bonds of tyranny or the chains of oppression.

The Republic of Armenia, patterned after the Republican government of the American system and some of the European nations, was born after the Great War amid the hopes of the Armenian people that they would finally realize their centuries-long dream of a free and independent nation of their own.

But the Armenians were unable to withstand the onslaught of other, more powerful countries. The Armenians had started their new country with the barest of resources and had believed they could coexist with their neighbors. Soon, Russia and Turkey were conspiring to end the Armenian dream of liberty. Just 2 years after the rebirth of Armenia that had once flourished as a proud nation before the rise of Greece and Rome, the Republic of Armenia succumbed to the strength of the Turkish and Russian Armies.

In those 50 years since the foundation of the Armenian Republic, other nations have come and gone, many forgotten by all but the historians. The principles of self-determination and freedom are expired dreams, lying in state with the nations that were created and nurtured on the slim hope that men would recognize the basic ideals of individual freedoms. The machinations of international diplomacy and power dealt the death blow to the Republic of Armenia because the world's free men did not care or would not be bothered with the struggling nation in the Caucasus Mountains.

But Armenia did not die in 1920, and the Armenian people did not end their valiant struggle for freedom, just as no free men surrender to the tyrants and the dictators who would lock the yoke of oppression around the neck of all men.

These people now living behind the barricades of intolerance and the thousands that live in exile, scattered across the world when their nation dissolved, have not forgotten Armenia. They will never relinquish their right to live again in their nation. It is their dream that one day the Armenians living in the U.S.S.R. and the Armenians denied the status of citizens will regain their nation.

On this 50th anniversary of the founding of the Armenian Republic on May 28, 1918, we, the free people of the world, must rededicate ourselves to the most basic principles of individual liberty under God—that all peoples should have the right to rule and govern themselves and be assured of a future for their children.

I congratulate the Armenians on this the anniversary of their Republic.

Theirs is not forgotten by free men.

REGRET FOR THE SITUATION IN WASHINGTON

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was looking forward to a visit by a group of patriotic high school students from Jennings, La. The group planned to visit Washington on June 6 and had made all the necessary arrangements, including a scheduled guided tour of the White House. For reasons best expressed in the letter which follows, the group has elected to cancel its trip to our Nation's Capital. How tragic that in this Nation, Americans are fearful to visit